

sidering the formation of a new party: "It is not important, I have observed, whether a man calls himself a Republican, a Democrat, or a Progressive. The public record teaches the voter how to test the fidelity of his Representative." I stand by that statement today.

By going into the Republican Party, we Progressives do not propose to be bound to support reactionary candidates or reactionary principles any more than my father or his associates were, or we were in the period before 1934.

I repeat, I have no illusions about some elements of the Republican Party. But I do discern a rising liberal movement within the Republican ranks. In the Senate, for example, I have frequently joined with men like Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, and Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, in sponsoring liberal legislation.

#### THE FUTURE OUTLOOK

No one can predict with certainty what the political alignment in the future will be. My opinion is that for the present the Progressives of Wisconsin can advance their cause most effectively within the Republican Party. The Progressive movement will not compromise its principles nor surrender its fighting spirit. It will continue to be a vital force in the State and Nation.

We have recently participated in a World War which smashed the totalitarian governments of our enemies. But democracy is still under attack at home and abroad. Every citizen who sincerely believes that men can have both economic opportunity and individual liberty must rally to defend and preserve the democratic way of life.

Progressives are steeped in the democratic tradition expressed in the Constitution, its Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence. They are experienced in the techniques of making these ideals realities in the lives of the American people. Progressives are schooled in the constant vigilance that the maintenance of individual freedom and liberty demands. Progressives will redouble their efforts to prove that even in an atomic age man can have economic security without yielding fundamental individual liberties to a totalitarian state.

Our task is great. Our cause is greater.

Whatever decision you make here today, I want you to know that so far as I am concerned, I am with you in this fight to the end.

### Petrillo and His Musicians Have Rights But They Must Not Resort to Force, Violence, Extortion, Intimidation, or Duress To Accomplish Their Aims

#### SPEECH

OF

**HON. JOHN M. ROBSION**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1946

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5177) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 as to non-commercial cultural programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the bill provides that it shall be unlawful to use force, violence, intimidation or duress to accomplish certain purposes in connection with broadcasting. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN] has offered an amendment which expressly reserves the right to the Amer-

ican Federation of Musicians to strike or quit their employment for any lawful purpose if they desire to do so; in other words, they cannot be fined or sent to jail if they strike unless it is accompanied by force, violence, intimidation, or duress.

If I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN] it would not protect James C. Petrillo, president of the American Federation of Musicians and his federation, if they used force, violence, intimidation, extortion, or duress to accomplish their purposes. Do I correctly understand the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. RABIN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There is a great deal of feeling and apparently, well founded, against Petrillo and some of the other top-flight officers of this organization. I have received no word in person, letter, or telegram from any individual, labor organization, or other group of workers expressing approval of Petrillo's conduct or protesting against this legislation. I have, however, received many communications from various other individuals, from organized workers, loyal union men, and other groups expressing disapproval of his dictatorial and high-handed oppressive conduct. The conduct of Petrillo has been and is doing great harm to organized labor. Here is one place where it appears there is urgent need for a real housecleaning among organized workers themselves, and according to the information I have, organized workers have roundly condemned Petrillo and his conduct.

Our Supreme Court, even before the New Deal, declared over and over that professional or individual workers had the right to organize to bargain collectively, to strike, and to engage in peaceful picketing. The courts hold that these rights are guaranteed to workers under the Constitution of the United States. We should not permit ourselves, because of the misconduct of Petrillo and a few others, to incorporate into law, unconstitutional provisions or attempt to take away any of the constitutional rights of Petrillo, or any other citizen.

The proponents of this legislation insist that the measure does not take away any of these rights; yet there are other Members of the House, as well as other persons who honestly believe it does attempt to take away these rights of these musicians. In order that there may be no question as to the intent of Congress, I can see no good reason why we should not adopt Mr. RABIN's amendment, which reserves these rights where the union is engaged in lawful acts to promote its objective. Mr. RABIN pointed out in his remarks that this amendment does not in any way authorize unlawful practices, such as force, violence, intimidation, or duress—unlawful acts.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does not the language of the amendment make the use of force, coercion, or violence unlawful only when it is used to compel or restrain a licensee to pay or agree to pay tribute? Does not the language of the amendment making use of force, coer-

cion, or violence unlawful only when it is used to compel a licensee to pay or agree to pay tribute and things like that? Certainly it does not interfere with the right to strike where wages are involved and for any legitimate reason as between a workingman and his employer.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We all agree that the workers have the right to strike and they can only be held liable under this act where there is used force, coercion, intimidation, or violence to compel the employer to do a certain act or to exact tribute from the employer or others.

I am convinced that, under the Constitution, we cannot deny the right to bargain collectively or to strike, and since the proponents concede that this position is sound, why not adopt the Rabin amendment and remove any question on this point?

A strong case has been made against Petrillo and some of the other officials of his organization, of force, violence, intimidation, and duress in carrying out their stranglehold on broadcasting in the demand and collection of tribute from broadcasting companies, citizens, as well as control of the members of his own organization. This control is almost beyond belief. This conduct should cease in the interest of organized labor itself, in the interest of free speech, fair and honest dealings, and the welfare of the entire country.

The radio is one of our greatest instrumentalities for free speech and to acquire information. It promptly carries news to the remotest sections of our country and the world. It provides a forum for discussions of our political, economic, and social problems. It is a great source of entertainment, music, and culture, and the vehicle for the message of all religions.

The American people complain generally that Petrillo has assumed to himself the power to prevent high-school and other school musicians from putting on free radio programs throughout the Nation unless they employ and pay an unnecessary orchestra provided by Petrillo, and in many instances the orchestra so employed renders no service and is not present. This has prevented any high-school musical programs from being put on the air since 1943. Petrillo exacts this tribute and the same situation prevails in putting on a church, welfare, or community radio program. They must pay tribute to Petrillo even though he and his group furnish no service, and in many instances are not even present. They have followed the same tactics in preventing the use of the United States Navy, Marine, and Army Bands to perform at memorial observances or patriotic celebrations. They will not permit these bands, paid out of the pockets of the taxpayers, to go on the radio on these occasions unless some group or citizen pays for one or more orchestras provided by Petrillo that are not present and do not perform and whose services are not needed or desired. Petrillo has reached such a point of dictatorial power and arrogance as to prevent his orchestras to appear on any broadcasting program unless these various demands are met. He has become a

the spirit of the progressive movement, the Progressive Party gave full cooperation to the national Democratic administration when that administration sponsored sound progressive legislation.

The Progressive Party in Wisconsin was the result of dissatisfaction with the old party alignments. Other States had similar experiences about the same time: The Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota, the Non-Partisan League in North Dakota, and other factional realignments in California, Nebraska, and Iowa. They drew to their support progressives from both the Republican and Democratic Parties. These movements were no political accidents. They were expressions of a need for both economic and social reform.

The New Deal supplied some of that reform in its early years, and almost universally received the support of the various minor parties who held comparable views to the Progressive Party.

There were signs prior to 1938 that the national Democratic Party had lost its zeal for liberalism. The city bosses and southern Democrats were anxious to put the brakes on further liberal legislation. Much had been done since 1933, but there were still millions of unemployed; the farmer's income was below cost of production; labor's rights were in jeopardy; millions had insufficient and inadequate diets, housing, and medical care; big business and finance had a stranglehold monopoly on small enterprise.

Was this the time to quit? The Progressive Party said "No." It laid plans to carry on. This time it was proposed to build a national organization, State by State. It was recognized this would take much time, but a better organization was necessary—one that had ground roots in every locality.

#### DECLINE OF THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY

The program never had a chance to get under way. The defeat suffered by the party in Wisconsin in 1938 was a mortal blow to the proposed national organization. A temporary come-back in the State was made with the successful gubernatorial candidacy of Oriand S. Loomis in 1942, but even that was doomed with his untimely death. The war, which eclipsed all domestic and State issues, snuffed out the last hope for a national progressive party at this time. It enveloped both old parties with an impenetrable smoke screen. All pending and unsolved problems were displaced with new war issues. The record of failures and broken promises was, for the moment, forgotten.

The spirit of national unity that prevailed during the war was desirable and essential to the winning of the war. However, it also had the effect of weakening the political structure of all the minority parties that normally exert powerful influences in a peacetime democracy. It was partially a matter of restraint on the part of the minority groups, but primarily the fact that all issues, no matter how important, become secondary when a country fights for its national existence on the battlefield.

The two major parties survive such a crisis because our political structure is so organized that it gives a tremendous advantage to a two-party system. Third parties can exist only when they have exceptional emotional appeal which overcomes the technical handicaps they encounter in the election laws and machinery in the State and local governments, as well as organizational problems they encounter in the State legislatures and the Congress. If not on a national basis, they suffer the additional disadvantage that they must either join with a major party on national issues, or else have no voice in national affairs.

This is all very evident in recent years, with the general decline of minority parties. In the Seventy-fifth Congress there were 17 minority-party Members. Now there are only 3—2 of them Progressives. All the minority

parties together cast only about 400,000 votes in the 1944 Presidential election.

These are only a few of the facts that we must face. And I want to emphasize that we are here today to deal with facts, not theories.

#### STATE PROBLEMS

We have always been hard pressed to build full tickets for the Progressive Party in all of Wisconsin's 71 counties. Although county officers are the local backbone of a political organization, we have never had full local tickets. County officers know that no principle or philosophy is at stake in the performance of their duties as coroner, sheriff, or clerk of court. They are reluctant to upset local voting alignments. We were aware of this difficulty when the party was founded in 1934. We hoped we could find a solution. Instead, we have continually run into the stubborn fact that county offices are non-partisan and not easily susceptible to a political realignment despite concurrence of the officers in Progressive principles.

This weakness on the county and local levels was translated to the State organization. It resulted in a constant deterioration. The turning away from the idea of a third and independent party in Wisconsin began in the localities. It culminated in a situation where we had local tickets in less than a dozen counties in 1944.

Yet, it is a fact that in county after county we have progressive-minded men and women serving in county offices. Most of them are serving as Republicans.

Thus, fellow Progressives, we are here to recognize a situation, not to create one. Most of you know that I have strongly resisted this trend away from independent, third-party action. However, the situation has now become so self-evident that I am reluctantly but decisively reconciled to facing the facts.

Where, then, do we go from here?

#### ALTERNATIVE COURSES

We have been deluged with political invitations. True, we have had no invitations from the self-appointed boss of the Wisconsin Republican Party or from the Communist Party. But Progressives would be insulted if they received invitations to join up with either Colemanism or communism.

If I read the press correctly, the Democrats have been especially vocal in their desire to have us join their ranks. What is the outlook for liberalism and progressivism in the Democratic Party?

I can assure you that the Democratic Party contains able, liberal men—men with whom I have been proud to fight shoulder to shoulder on many occasions during my 20 years in the United States Senate.

In my opinion, the Democratic Party is now stalled on dead center. Although it is the party in power, with a clear majority in both Houses of Congress, it has been unable to act with sufficient unity of purpose to meet the urgent problems of today. The Democratic Party has become so enmeshed in bureaucratic control and intraparty wrangling that some of its leaders are resigning in disgust.

The political genius of President Roosevelt welded together a coalition of many diverse elements, every shade of political opinion from out-and-out Communists to reactionary political bosses. His emphasis was on issues and principles, but the party emphasis today is more concerned with maintaining political control than with fighting for liberal legislation and progressive principles. The unmistakable signs of dissolution and disintegration are evident.

Fundamental divergences of opinion with the present administration, for example, have been expressed recently by men like Harold Ickes, Philip Murray, Hatton Sumners, R. J. Thomas, James Patton, of the Farmers' Union, and many another leader and organization, once the bulwark of sup-

port for the Democratic Party when it was the party of the New Deal and the common man.

Let your mind run over the history of recent legislation in Congress. In almost every vital field—full employment, labor legislation, housing, rural electrification, unemployment compensation, and many other critical issues—legislation has been killed, emasculated, or frozen in committee, and this despite the fact that Democrats have control of both Houses and every committee of the Congress.

But, we are told, the Democratic Party contains many liberal members. Of course it does. But were they able to beat the machine at Chicago in 1944? You know the sordid record of that convention.

What of the Democratic Party in Wisconsin? I am well aware that it numbers able, sincere liberals in its ranks. But these liberals are not the Democratic Party in Wisconsin. The Democratic Party in this State is a machine-minded organization without principle or program. Look at its record in the State legislature.

Most of its State senators and assemblymen have lined up time and time again with the reactionary Republicans in opposing Governor Goodland, just as they lined up again and again with reactionary Republicans in opposing the liberal program of Progressive governors. For your answer, look at the roll calls prepared by the Madison Capital Times or those prepared by other liberal groups.

As I have said before, we are here to recognize a situation—not to create one. The fact is written in past election returns that the Progressive Party in the present condition cannot serve as a vehicle for the advancement of progressive principles. It is also clear from the record that the Democratic Party is not our hope for a liberal instrument for political action.

#### PROSPECTS IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

What is our alternative? I have no illusion about some of the elements of the Republican Party. I have fought their tooth and nail. I have worked against reaction in the Republican Party ever since I was old enough to carry my father's briefcase. My record is full of detailed denunciations of the old guard in the Republican Party.

Nevertheless, I am convinced that the Republican Party of Wisconsin offers us the best opportunity for the advancement of Progressive principles. I do not mean for a moment that the Republican Party of Wisconsin, as presently bossed and controlled, is a liberal vehicle. Far from it. But I am convinced we have a better chance of putting our Progressive ideals on the lawbooks if we go into the Republican Party.

Wisconsin has always been a Republican State—and by this I don't mean a reactionary State. Some of the most far-seeing legislation ever enacted anywhere in America was enacted in our State when Progressives were in the Republican Party. Only once in 50 years have the Democrats succeeded to power in this State. A party that can succeed only once in half a century doesn't offer much opportunity to translate progressive principles into law.

Of one thing we can be certain. Our return to the Republican Party offers no comfort to the die-hard Tory bosses of the Republican Party. Anyone who has read a Wisconsin paper during the last year knows what cries of anguish have been coming from the citadels of Republican bossism in Wisconsin at the prospect of the return of the Progressives. We can be equally certain that our return will bring cheer and encouragement to those Republicans who have been battling the reactionaries.

I want to make it as clear as I can that this change of political framework will not in one iota change our stand on the basic issues of our time. I said in 1934 when we were con-

pant young thing in the early "firties" taking the orders. [Laughter.] One of those things that is all vogue on the outside and all vague on the inside. [Laughter.]

She took the orders of the five men. I hope Their Excellencies and His Eminence will pardon me for this. She took the orders of the five men, and then looked at me, and said, "Well, Cock Robin, what will you have?" [Laughter.]

Then, here is another peculiar paradox about the Irish. We are called the fighting Irish. I think I gave you a talk some years ago on the fighting Irish.

As I remember it, I developed the idea that a man does not fight because he hates. He fights because he loves, and since an Irishman loves more than anyone else, he fights more than anyone else. [Laughter.] But one of the peculiar paradoxes that are now coming out is that this fighting race was not in this war. [Applause.] And, more than that, they are not even a member of the peace organization. You know, chapter II of the United Nations Charter states that the organization is open to peace-loving nations, [laughter] which is not a very good standard, because it is purely subjective.

I think we all agree that it ought to be open to law-abiding agents. [Applause.] Article I of chapter 2 states that the original members are all those who declared war, so now we have the terrible paradox of the fighting Irish not being in a peace organization because they did not go to war. [Laughter.]

But though we were not in the war officially, let me tell you that there is one country that was in this war that has fifteen times the population of Ireland, and it gave only one-twentieth the number of soldiers. Ireland during the war shipped over 2,000 cattle a day to England, and at one time all they got back was a little bull, too. [Laughter.]

There were 250,000 Irishmen fighting in this war on our side [applause], and it is worth recording that the two greatest heroes of Great Britain were Irishmen, Montgomery and Pat Finlaycune.

But though the Irishman is always interested in getting the better of an argument, there is one time when he is very humble, and that is when his soul is at stake. Not very long ago, there was a plane coming into LaGuardia Field. It was out about 15 minutes, and it radioed into LaGuardia Field, "Colonel Ginsberg landing at LaGuardia Field with 50 gallons of gasoline and one atomic bomb."

No answer came back. A few minutes later, another message came in, "Colonel Ginsberg landing in LaGuardia Field, 15 gallons of gasoline and one atomic bomb."

No answer.

Then, in came the next message, "Colonel Ginsberg landing LaGuardia Field, 1 gallon of gas and one atomic bomb," and immediately there came back the answer, "Colonel Riley speaking to Colonel Ginsberg. Repeat after me these words: 'Oh, my God, I am heartily sorry.'" [Laughter.]

Apropos of this basic humility of the Irish when the spirit is at stake, after all, who of us shall ever forget the greatest American of them all who used to grace his days, "God rest his soul," Al Smith. [Applause.]

He was the kind of an American and the kind of an Irishman and the kind of a Catholic who, when he was dying, called in all of his political enemies, really not enemies, just opposition, and said, "If there is anything that I have ever done in my life to have hurt you, I ask your forgiveness."

And when the pastor came a few days before he died, Al had already been absolved, and Al said again, "Father, give me absolution." He pulled himself up in the bed, and the priest said, "All right, lean back." Al said, "No, I want to take it standing."

And then, continuing that same spirit,

there was a policeman here in New York who directed traffic up around Fifty-ninth Street and Fifth Avenue. It was Good Friday, and an out-of-town car hit him and knocked him into the gutter. He arose, as best he could, stumbled over to the car, and he was immediately about to reprimand the driver, and then he said, "Oh, this is Good Friday. This is the day the Lord forgave his enemies. It is now 12 o'clock, and so, I forgive you," and with that he dropped dead.

With all the inflation of the Irish, and all of their aristocracy, that is their basic humility.

That brings us to the larger view of Ireland. Almighty God in His providential ordering of this world, has set two bastions and fortresses on either side of Europe, Ireland on the one side and Poland on the other.

Ireland is like a child that has come dripping out of the baptismal waters of the great Atlantic, and Poland is like a sword that has driven into the eastern half of Europe, shut out the heresies of the East, and both of these countries have exactly the same vocation in the world, to preserve the heritage of Christianity, democracy and human rights in all Europe.

Both of them have been the source of considerable political foment, and, basically, because of this vocation. Poland in the east and Ireland in an empire.

Their courses have run very much the same. But now there is a slight difference, and it is only temporary, please God.

Ireland, in its history, and let us not forget it, was the one country that preserved culture and civilization in Europe when the barbarians overran it. They swept down from the north and knocked at the gates of Rome, and those gates would not open for them, and they pushed them in and Rome fell just as Satan fell from heaven. Then there came the Franks into Gaul, and the Jutes and the Angles and the Saxons into Great Britain, and just as certain peoples in Europe are now being pushed westward into our zone, so, too, the scholars and the culture and the civilization of Europe was pushed back and back and back to the west until, finally, the call came and they concentrated in the only land that the barbarians did not conquer, namely, the land of Ireland.

So full was Ireland in those days of scholars from all over Europe that Armagh was populated by one-third foreigners, and Dr. Johnson is quoted by Boswell as saying that Ireland became the school of the west during the Dark Ages.

Then finally, when Ireland had educated these people, and then the barbarians themselves began to receive the faith, what did Ireland do? She sent back all of the culture and civilization, back again into Europe, and out of Ireland, for example, went Columbkille into England, practically recivilizing England so that in the year, 1602, every bishop in England was an Irishman except one, and he was a Frenchman educated in Ireland.

Then out from Ireland went Columbanus. He went through Burgundy and went through Italy, so that even today in 20 towns in Italy there are 120 churches that are named after Irish saints, if you please.

Finally then this great missionary came to Gregory the Great. He was a tiny little man, and he prostrated himself before the Holy Father, and Gregory raised his hands and said, "I thank Almighty God that such strength should be given to a little man," and then out came that aristocracy of the Irish, even in those days, and Columbanus arose and said, "He who depreciates the worker depreciates the Divine Author." [Laughter.]

Then when Charlemagne opened his schools, it was the Irish scholars who were the foremost teachers.

What Ireland was doing for civilization in those days, that Poland has done traditionally. It kept the civilization of Europe safe, when the Turks, the Moslems, and the Mohammedans would have swept over Europe, and then, even in our own times, it kept Europe safe. For in 1920 when Tuckochevetsky (?) boasted of the fact that he would lead the first Godless army throughout the world and came into Poland, the ranks of the Polish Army were broken and spent. And then the army marched on toward Warsaw, and every single diplomat in Warsaw left, save one, a certain Monsignor Rattl, who belonged to the staff of the Vatican.

The people came to him and said, "Only your prayers now, Monsignor, can save us." This army came on toward Warsaw as Monsignor Rattl organized a novena in honor of Our Blessed Lady. It began on the 6th of August, which was the Feast of the Transfiguration, and was to continue until the 15th of August. Three days before that ended, Tuckochevetsky was within 12 miles of Warsaw; 2 days before they were within 9 miles of Warsaw; and the day before they were within 6.

And then Monsignor Rattl addressed a group of schoolboys in Warsaw, reminding them of the mission of Poland, the mission to save the civilization and the democracy and the rights and the heritage that had come from Divinity, and General Pilsudski gathered together an army from these boys and attacked from the rear, and, at the same time, made a flank attack, and they broke them up in what has been called the nineteenth greatest battle of the world, the Battle of the Vistula.

The civilization of the world was saved, and the man who did it was Monsignor Rattl, who afterward became Pius XI.

Poland then fulfilled a mission. It was exactly the same as Ireland's mission, namely, to save Europe.

And now poor Poland. Poor Poland is now suffering. Originally crucified, divided, and now a million or more refugees in a foreign land. The bishop ordains two deacons in order that they may administer to the refugees, and the next morning they are taken out and shot. Hundreds of them are loaded into boxcars. One particular group remains on a siding for 48 days, and then finally when they arrive at their destination, 32 of them are frozen to death.

And in the midst of all this suffering, there is one nation that can speak, Ireland. Ireland, speak to Poland, and say to Poland, "We understand your sorrow and your cross. Once upon a time there was a £4 bounty upon the head of every priest. The mass in Ireland testify our allegiance to a faith. Our head schools bear witness to the days when we taught among the foreigners. Then we say to you, 'O Poland, be strong.' In the language of St. Paul, 'We have fought the good fight. We have kept the faith.'"

Poland and Ireland are perhaps like James and John, those Apostles who asked to be seated on the right- and the left-hand side of the Saviour of the Kingdom, and so we are one at the right side of Europe and one at the left. The Saviour asked these two boys if they could drink the chalice of His suffering, and so, too, you, Poland, and we of Ireland, have been asked to drink of that chalice.

We are finished drinking it. You are drinking it now, but be brave and strong in that faith, O Poland.

We are the only nation in the world that can teach you to be steadfast among such sorrows and such trials and such woes, and we pray God with you that a day may come when both of us will stretch our hands out across all Europe in a day of peace, and form upon the breast of Europe the august embrace of the Cross of Christ.

[Rising applause.]

czar over broadcasting stations and over the organizations and groups who desire to use these stations. They must all pay tribute and give in to Petrillo.

We are told that Petrillo collects in tribute through his methods of coercion, extortion, duress, and threats annually approximately \$20,000,000. The American people have tolerated these conditions for a long time. They have been and are now demanding that Congress give them relief. Mr. Petrillo has himself to thank for bringing about this legislation. Petrillo has developed a constitution and bylaws for his organization, and as president he can modify or set aside provisions of the constitution and bylaws of this organization, and it is so set up that a very small minority controls the organization. Mr. Petrillo and his musicians have rights. The broadcasting stations and various organizations and groups who use these stations also have rights, and the rights, interests, and welfare of the American people as a whole must not be overlooked.

I favor the Rabin amendment because I believe in that wonderful motto engraved in marble over the door of the beautiful Supreme Court of the United States—"Justice Under Law." This is a land of law and order. No individual or group is justified in using force, violence, extortion, intimidation, or duress to accomplish their aims and purposes.

### It's Getting To Be a Habit

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House on March 14, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Standard-Star published at New Rochelle, N. Y., titled "It's Getting To Be a Habit":

#### IT'S GETTING TO BE A HABIT

The Dunn Survey of Greenwich, which has been disappointingly accurate in its predictions of Democratic successes at the polls in recent years, looks ahead to the fall and asserts that the Democratic Party will increase their number of seats in the House of Representatives by 50.

It was this same survey which reported before the 1944 election that with 3,000,000 Federal employees, Roosevelt would win by "about 400 electoral votes." He actually got 432 that year.

The Dunn prediction is that this same "bought" vote will control in 1946 as it did in 1944. And in this connection it points out that where there were just before the 1942 congressional elections 986,000 Federal employees in the 9 key political States of the Union, there are now in those same States, 1,177,000 Federal employees, a gain of 20 percent.

So, says the survey, since there appears to be no GOP effort to meet this pay-roll vote, 1946 will be the same thing all over again.

We hope the prediction is wrong but fear it may be right.

### Address by Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen Before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JAMES M. MEAD**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21 (legislative day of  
Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick at the Hotel Astor, in New York City, on March 16, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May I please your eminence, Mr. President, your excellencies, Mr. Secretary, friends, I am not so sure that my return here tonight for the fifth time is the proof of my popularity. It may be a proof of the fact that a criminal often returns to the scene of his crime. [Laughter.]

It was very good of the president to say something about my being an orator. I really believe that I am. Honestly I do [laughter], because I always notice that when I finish speaking there is a great awakening [laughter].

This is a marvelous manifestation of unity. Everyone tonight is Irish. During the Notre Dame-Army game everybody in New York is an alumnus of Notre Dame, and it seems here tonight that we are very happy to incorporate under the name of Ireland and the Irish everyone who has charity and love in his heart. The way we get together on this night and the unity we find here reminds me of Duffy in Ireland who had a circus, and he had a wild tiger that everyone loved to see. But, unfortunately, the tiger died, and then Duffy was rather forlorn at the loss of this beast which had made him so much money, and he confided his loss to Pat, and Pat said, "Don't be downhearted, Duffy," he said, "Give me a few good drinks of Irish whisky, skin the tiger, let me get inside of the tiger's skin, put me into the cage, and I will be as wild a tiger as anyone ever saw in Duffy's circus."

Accordingly, Pat took a few drinks, got into the tiger's skin, got into the cage, and those who came to the circus agreed that it was as wild a tiger as anyone had ever seen. But as he was cavorting about the cage, he looked out of the corner of his eye, and there, over in the other end of it was a lion, and all of that primitive fury and anger that the lion seems to bear against the tiger seemed to be shining in the lion's eyes, and Pat moved over cautiously toward the door, and finally he stood erect and he shouted out, "Faith, let me out," and with that the lion pounced on poor Pat and he fell prone upon the ground and as he felt the weight of the great beast upon him, here, coming from inside of the lion's mouth was, "Tis all right, Pat, I am from Cork, too." [Laughter.]

First of all, about the Irish and then about Ireland, I want to talk about a couple of paradoxes of the Irish character. One is the paradox of their democracy and their aristocracy. The two seem to be rather exclusive, but they fit together in the Irish for some peculiar reason or other.

Have you ever noticed how very different the Irish are about their own than other peoples? When, for example, a young Jewish boy makes a success of himself, everybody points up to him. They lift him up as "one

of our boys." When an Irishman gets up, everybody pulls him down. [Laughter.] I wonder why that is. It probably is because of a fundamental instinct for democracy inside of the Irish. They want everybody to be absolutely equal. [Laughter.] Just as soon as one head gets above the other, he is immediately tapped upon the head and downed to the level of the others.

Now, why are the Irish so very democratic that way? I think the reason is to be found in the fact that they are all aristocrats. Every Irishman thinks that he is a descendant of the king, and nobody can be better than a king. [Laughter.] That is why they pull him down to the level of kingship. [Laughter.]

That, too, accounts probably for the Irish tendency to deflate others if they get a chance, and sometimes to inflate themselves. I will speak of that in a moment. [Laughter.]

I recall not very long ago I was working with someone in Washington whom I tried to get to take the pledge. He was constantly getting into a state of amiable incandescence. [Laughter.] I use good English before the Friendly Sons. [Laughter.] You notice, too, how Mr. Secretary skirted that subject with fine language.

And I was passing by a saloon the other night, and out came Hank, and I said, "Hank, I thought I told you that liquor was your worst enemy." He said, "I heard you preach, 'Love your enemies.'" [Laughter.] I said, "I did, but I didn't say swallow them." [Laughter.]

But there is the instinct of the Irish for democracy. Deflate somebody if you get a chance.

I was once preaching in an Irish community, and a woman got up with her crying child to take the child out of the church. I thought I would relieve her embarrassment, and I said, "It is quite all right, madam, the child isn't bothering me." She said, "I know, but you are bothering the child." [Laughter.]

Then, too, on the aristocratic side, the Irish always like to get ahead of everyone else in an argument. Have you ever noticed that? [Laughter.] The gypsy likes to get ahead of you in a trade, but the Irishman in an argument. I am not beyond that myself. [Laughter.]

Some time ago I was on my way up to Boston, and when I got on the train here at the Grand Central Station, I sat alongside of an Episcopalian clergyman. We got into a theological argument concerning the validity of Anglican orders. He contended that he had divine powers and that he could consecrate, that he could forgive sins, etc. I contended he could not.

It is not to the point of the story to tell you how we argued. We argued all the way from New York to Hartford. He got off at Hartford. [Laughter.]

There must have been something of the feminine in him, because he wanted the last word. So did I. [Laughter.] And just as he was getting off, as if to assure himself of the argument, he turned to me and said to me, "Remember Father Sheen, there isn't anything that you can do that I can't do." I said, "Oh, yes, there is. I can kiss your wife, but you can't kiss mine." [Laughter.]

Then, I will never forget how I was deflated in my turn-out in Cleveland not so long ago. I was to give a talk out there in the auditorium of the Hotel Cleveland, and I arrived rather late. I had had no dinner, and I went up to my room and put on my cassock, and I said to the five members of the committee that I had had nothing to eat, and would they be good enough to go down to the dining room with me while I ordered a glass of milk and some graham crackers before the lecture.

We went into the dining room, and there were no men waiters. There was just a flip-